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**Reviewer’s report:**

The questions posed by the authors are well defined. This is an interesting paper reporting on a pilot study assessing a group intervention based on CBT and problem solving for 30-55 year old women with many symptoms of depression living in socially deprived areas. The groups were run by non-professional facilitators following a manual and this was considered as an attempt to design a low-cost intervention based on CBT.

The methods used are appropriate and well described and the data is sound. In my opinion the manuscript adheres to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition. The tables and figures are clear. The discussion and conclusions is well balanced and adequately supported by the data. The limitations of the work are clearly stated and on p. 21 the authors acknowledge this and point out the limitation that they did not include a formal diagnostic interview to compare with the PHQ-9.

The title of the paper may be misleading. It would be more appropriate to indicate this by naming the paper e.g. Group CBT therapy for women with many symptoms of depression rather than mild to moderate depression.

The abstract accurately conveys what has been found.

The authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building.

The writing is acceptable.

**Minor essetital revisions:**

References

Minor issue not for publication; References #2-3 and 20-26 are printed in italic rather than bold.

Results

Minor issue not for publication; A sentence at the bottom of second paragraph in results needs revising „The short period of intensive (recruitment?) also meant that community organisations had little time to plan or invite people to join the groups.“

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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